# Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

### ESTRELLA LYSANDRA ZAYAS,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOSE ORTEGA, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 17-cv-02739-EMC

### ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Docket No. 108

Plaintiff's request for relief is denied. First, she has failed to show that she should be given leave to file a motion for reconsideration. See Civ. L.R. 7-9(b). She is making an argument that she never previously raised for the Court's consideration. See Docket No. 84, at 46 (Plaintiff arguing that the instruction should not be given because, "[c]learly, the Defendant is not a professional").

Second, even if the Court were to grant Plaintiff leave to file a motion for reconsideration, her motion to reconsider lacks merit. The Directions for Use for CACI 602 do not limit the use of the instruction to situations where the plaintiff has hired the defendant as a professional. Furthermore, as the Court previously noted, California courts have evaluated negligence claims against law enforcement officers as professional negligence cases. See, e.g., Harris v. Smith, 157 Cal. App. 3d 100 (1984) (in a case where plaintiff claimed that a deputy sheriff had an affirmative duty to plaintiff, after he commenced an investigation, to exercise reasonable care in the performance of his investigation, evaluating alleged negligence of deputy sheriff as a matter of professional negligence).

The Court, however, shall retitle the instruction so that it no longer refers to "success." This is consistent with the Court's order at Docket No. 102, at 33 (striking the language "his

## United States District Court

27

28

1	efforts are unsuccessful or" because "it could be con
2	case"). The new title for the instruction is: "NEGLI
3	ENFORCEMENT OFFICER."
4	The Court also makes one correction to the i
5	instead of "official" in the second sentence.
6	Finally, the Court shall reorder the instruction
7	the instruction on custom or practice.
8	The Court shall forthwith issue the revised F
9	
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.
11	
12	Dated: October 22, 2018
13	
14	
15	Un
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

nfusing to the jury given the facts of this IGENCE – REASONABLE LAW instruction: the term "officer" should be used

ons so that the instruction at issue comes before

Final Jury Instructions to reflect the above.

nited States District Judge